

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****REMARKS CONCERNING THE AMENDMENTS****SEP 29 2006**

The above amendments to the claims add limitations to claims from within the original disclosure. The use of "manufactured" intelligence in new claim 41 finds antecedent basis generally in the specification and, for example, in paragraph [0053] of the published application and the term "local processor" used in other claims finds antecedent basis in paragraph [0070].

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SUMMARY OF THE OFFICE ACTION

SEP 29 2006

- 1) Claims 23-25 are objected to with respect to a defect in the language in the prwamble of these claims.
- 2) Claim 22 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite with respect to "each player position having its own intelligence."
- 3) Claims 1-5, 7-24 and 26-29 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Miyamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,607,443 B1).
- 4) Claims 25 and 30-40 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyamoto et al. (as applied above) when further considered.

RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****SEP 29 2006**

- 1) Claims 23-25 are objected to with respect to a defect in the language in the preamble of these claims.

Claims 23-25 have been amended and the objectionable language has been eliminated. This objection has been removed.

- 2) Claim 22 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite with respect to "each player position having its own intelligence."

Claim 22 has been amended to remove the concern that intelligence included the human mind. The addition of the limitation of "local processor...that executes code" in claims 1-40 and "manufactured" intelligence in claim 41 eliminates that concern.

- 3) Claims 1-5, 7-24 and 26-29 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Miyamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,607,443 B1).

- 4) Claims 25 and 30-40 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyamoto et al. (as applied above) when further considered.

Both of these issues will be addressed at the same time, below.

All claims (except for claims 6 and 25) have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) or 35 USC 103(a) over Miyamoto et al. (alone) and claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Miyamoto et al. in view of Dote.

The Examiner points to column 2, lines 41-64; and column 14, lines 4-49 of Miyamoto et al. for a teaching of an individual processing board (intelligence) at each player position. The specific disclosure states:

"The game device which pertains to the present invention provides a game device which executes a prescribed game program corresponding to information entered by players, comprising: means for recognizing voices and/or actions made by the players; means for determining conditions of recognized voices and/or actions; and

processor for performing response processing corresponding to the conditions of recognized voices and/or actions.” (Column 2, lines 10-14); and

“FIG. 21(B) depicts an example in which one additional sensor is placed between sensors 401b and 401c, and FIG. 21(C) depicts an example in which one additional sensor is placed adjacent to sensor 401a. The details of sensor operation will be described in detail shortly, after presenting a brief description of the function of the additional sensors shown in FIG. 21(B) and FIG. 21(C). The additional sensor shown in FIG. 21(B) is used for accurate detection of hand movement in the sideways direction (STAND command). A STAND command decision is made where an object is sensed in the order: sensor 401b.fwdarw.401.fwdarw.401c (or the reverse). Conversely, a STAND command decision is not made where the object is sensed in the order: sensor 401a.fwdarw.401.fwdarw.401b (or 401c) (a HIT command, decision, described shortly, is made, or example). The additional sensor in FIG. 21(C) is used for accurate detection of movement of the hand placing it in a prescribed location (HIT command). When an object is sensed by either sensor 401a or 401, and the sense interval continues for a relatively long period of time, a HIT command is posited. The additional sensor ensures reliable sensing even if hand position is out of place to a certain extent.” (Column 14, lines 4-49)

These teachings do not provide even a suggestion of the presence of manufactured intelligence at each player position. The functions provided by the sensors in the Miyamoto disclosure are little more than ‘button’ functions, such that when stimulated, an electrical signal is sent. One signal (disclosed in the column 14 disclosure) is essentially only that light is being blocked. This is a direct sensitivity reading (hence a sensor is used, not a logic processor) and does not imply, suggest, teach or instruct the use of manufactured intelligence.

The same can be said for the disclosure of the voice sensing system of column 2, where the pitch and volume and length of a sound are signaled. There is no intelligence function or code execution. This is nothing more than a direct transmittal of received sound by a signal reflecting the received signal.

It is to be noted that the present specification describes intelligence as:

“...the ability to execute code, either provided in the form of software or hardware circuits. Such processing may at least comprise some of signal converting (e.g., signals from player card readers, credit deposit, currency readers, coin readers, touch screen signals, control panel signals) into a signal that can be included in an information packet and interpreted by the main game computer when the signal is sent.”

The sensors in Miyamoto do not perform any such conversion function and do not execute code in any manner. The issuance of the STAND or HIT commands described in these sections is made in the game processor or main processor after receipt of the sensed information from the sensors. There is no disclosure of the presence of manufactured intelligence at the player positions. The sensors do no more than signal detection in terms of raw responses such as: Light is sensed; light is not sensed, sound is heard, sound is not heard; sound volume is {1-10}; length of sound is [1-10] seconds; etc. This is not performance of any intelligence function, but merely transmission of a signal in direct response to stimulus without modification. The term "to execute code" or its equivalence has been added to all independent claims. This single limitation is by itself sufficient to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 102(b).

There is no basis from the references of record in the rejection under 35 USC 102(a) for asserting this difference to be obvious from the teachings of those references. There are significant benefits of this construction that are not taught by the references or the art of record. These benefits include at least the ability to modularize the wagering device so that individual player units can be replaced for some significant device malfunctions without having to reprogram the entire system, without having to have the entire unit reapproved by gaming oversight functions, and to reduce the distal computing power needed in the game processor or main processor by distributing the intelligence functions. The local processor also enables the entire reporting function of the system with the main computer to operate more quickly. These are significant technical advantages enabled by the use of the local processor that executes codes, a structure that is not taught by Miyamoto et al.

The rejection is in error on a fundamental limitation recited in every claim. There is no teaching of individual player position processors at a multi-player video format system with a common screen such as that recited in the claims. The rejection is therefore clearly in error and must be withdrawn.

The attorney of record and at least one Applicant have reviewed the Miyamoto specification to determine if there is other disclosure that might lend itself as material to the issues of patentability being evaluated in this rejection and response. Text not cited by the Examiner in the rejection that appears to be at least superficially relevant to the issues includes:

"The game device which pertains to the present invention comprises optical input means for sensing player actions and converting these to electrical signals; first processor for computing player action on the basis of said electrical signals from said optical input means; control means for direct control by the players; and second processor for developing the game corresponding to computation result from said first processor and/or control commands from said control means." (Column 2, lines 41-47)

"Referring to the drawings, the interactive game device 1 broadly comprises an upward projecting section 2 on whose screen a character simulating the dealer is displayed, a plurality of satellites 3 located on the player side, and a forward extending section 4 extending forward from the upward projecting section 2 towards the satellites 3. The housing 5 on which the satellites 3 are arranged houses a motherboard 6, power circuitry, and other circuitry. The motherboard 6 is capable of executing the game and other information processing operations."

"Each satellite 3 is provided with its own CRT satellite display 10, each satellite display 10 displaying the cards of a particular player. Each of the satellite displays 10 is are electrically connected to the motherboard 6. While the satellite displays 10 described above comprise CRT, other types of displays are possible. Specifically, displays having other display formats, such as plasma displays or liquid crystal displays, may be used provided that the device is capable of displaying electrical signals as images."

"Each of the satellites 3 is further provided with a microphone 13, the microphones 13 being electrically connected to the motherboard 6. The microphones 13 convert into sound signals sounds uttered by the players sitting at the satellites, and these signals are presented to the motherboard 6. The microphones 13 convert sounds issued by players sitting at the satellites 3 into sound signals which are presented to the motherboard 6."

"Let it be assumed, for example, that the satellite display 10 of a certain player shows an "A" card and a "10" card, as depicted in FIG. 6(A), and the player makes a sound. The sound is converted into a sound signal by the microphone 13 and is input to the sound recognition circuit 15. In the sound recognition circuit 15 it is recognized which of prescribed reference level bands the level of the sound signal corresponds to, and a sound recognition signal of sound signal level "1" indicating a sound recognition outcome below the first threshold value SHa is input to the sub-CPU 204. The main CPU then moves on to the next process (S102; YES).

"Specifically, in the event that the sound recognition signal is level "1" (S103; "1"), the main CPU 201 displays a level "1" on the indicator 550 located on the satellite display 10, and expression data "1" for a dealer expression like that depicted in FIG. 6(D) is selected for display on the display 7 (step 104). Specifically, the process involves the main CPU 201 giving an image creation instruction to the picture block 21 based on the sound recognition signal (level "1"), whereupon image data for display as a screen 600 of a female dealer having the expression shown in FIG. 7(0), for example, is modified to image data for displaying a screen 600a of the dealer with the expression shown in FIG. 7(1)." [In conjunction with these last two paragraphs, please note elements 13 and 15 in the bottom left hand corner of FIG. 4] (Column 7, line 45 through column 8, line 2)"

Preliminary analysis of the disclosure of Miyamoto et al., which should be further reviewed and considered by the Examiner, is that the location of element 15, the "recognition circuit" is again only a button type function, with the sensor or recognition function providing a raw signal in response to direct stimulus, and does not provide an intelligence function that executes code. There is absolutely no indication or implication of code executing intelligence in the recognition circuit.

The rejections of record are in error and must be withdrawn.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 29 2006

CONCLUSION

All rejections are in error. All claims should be allowed.

If the Examiner believes that issues remain that might warrant personal discussion with the attorney of record to clarify or resolve issues, the Examiner is courteously invited to call the attorney of record at 952.832.9090 during regular business hours in the Central Time Zone of 7:00 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

PHILIP STEVEN SMITH et al.

By his Representatives,
MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
YORK BUSINESS CENTER, SUITE 205
3209 West 76th Street
Edina, MN 55435
(952) 832.9090

Date 29 SEPTEMBER 2006


By



Mark A. Litman, Reg. No. 26,390

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile transmission to the US Patent and Trademark Office addressed to MAIL STOP: AMENDMENT, P.O. BOX 1450; Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 29 SEPTEMBER 2006.

Name Mark A. Litman



Signature